



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

C1C

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,143	09/09/2003	Yoo-Hun Suh	P24188	1665

7055 7590 06/03/2005

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, LEONARD M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/657,143	Applicant(s) SUH ET AL.	
	Examiner Leonard M. Williams	Art Unit 1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating dementia and impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function, does not reasonably provide enablement for preventing dementia and impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApl 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7)

the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

(1) The Nature of the Invention:

The rejected claims are drawn to a pharmaceutical composition for preventing and treating dementia and for preventing and treating the impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function.

(2) Breadth of the Claims:

The instant claims embrace preventing or treating dementia and for preventing and treating the impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function by use of a pharmaceutical composition which contains minocycline as an active ingredient.

(3) Guidance of the Specification:

The guidance of the specification as to the prevention of dementia and the impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function is completely lacking. The specification indicates on page 21 section [130], that mice pretreated with the inventive composition of the present application showed significantly reduced latency time compared to the control group that was not pretreated when both groups were induced to dementia by deposition of CT105 protein into their brains. ON page 23 section [145] the water maze test was performed showing the same treated as that demonstrated in the above described test. Neither test indicates that dementia was prevented just that the mice treated with the inventive composition did better than the non-treated mice.

Neither experiment demonstrates complete prevention of dementia and the impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function. Additionally no human studies were presented.

(4) Working Examples:

Applicant does not provide any working examples for the prevention of dementia and the impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function.

(5) State/predictability of the Art:

The state of the art regarding treating dementia and the impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function is relatively high. However, the state of the art for prevention of dementia and the impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function is underdeveloped.

(6) The Quantity of Experimentation Necessary:

The instant claims read on the prevention of dementia and the impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function in all of its forms. As discussed above, the specification fails to provide sufficient support for completely protecting against dementia and the impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function. Applicant fails to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation. Genetech, 108 F.3d at 1366 states that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion"

and "patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable."

Accordingly the claims are evaluated as a composition for treating dementia and the impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function and not as a composition for preventing dementia and the impairment of learning and memory and cognitive function.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rydel et al. (US Patent No. 5707821).

Rydel et al. teach, in col. 19 lines 10-65, that compounds capable of inhibiting PLA2 and neuronal degeneration in Alzheimer's disease models can be used to retard or reduce AD-type neuropathology in vivo, and thus can be formulated in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier for parenteral, topical, and oral administration.

Rydel et al. teach, in Example 5 and Table 3, pretreatment of human cortical neurons with a series of PLA2 inhibitors (including minocycline) and subsequent exposure of the pretreated human cortical neurons to A β 1-40 at concentrations of 90nM to 100 μ M in ddH₂O (a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier), in order to determine the effects of the compounds on neuronal survival. Table 3 demonstrates that minocycline

Art Unit: 1617

inhibits PLA2 and protects human neurons from toxicity due to exposure to pathogenic A β peptide anticipating the "...pharmaceutical composition...which contains minocycline...." of claims 1 and 9, and the "...pharmaceutical composition..." of claims 2-8 and 10-20.

The examiner respectfully points out the following: A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

The examiner respectfully points out the following from MPEP § 2112.01: "[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer." *Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonard M Williams whose telephone number is 571-272-0685. The examiner can normally be reached on MF 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LMW


SREENI PADMANABHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER